

hybrid-powered vehicles, to eventually, this decade, fuel cells. We can literally go out today and buy, off the shelf, air-conditioners that use half the electricity that most of the air-conditioners in our homes use. The same is true for the furnaces that will warm our homes this winter.

The question before us now is, How do we proceed to an energy bill? How do we take it up? I have been urging my leadership, for months now, to take up an energy bill. My guess is, before I finish, my leader will regret having ever put me on the Energy Committee, but I want us to debate and report to this body, and to debate in this Chamber, an energy bill. I want to have a chance to do it this month. I want us to have a chance to vote up or down on Senator MURKOWSKI's proposal of opening up the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. I want us to have a chance to vote on a whole host of other issues. But I want us to debate them, and vote on them, and move on. I do not want the debate to be, in what form do we bring the bill to the floor? Do we go through the Energy Committee? Do we then go through the Finance Committee, and then the Environment and Commerce Committees because they have jurisdiction over different parts of the bill.

I want to get the bill to the floor. And as we do, I want to make sure that the Senator from Alaska, the Senator from Delaware, the Senator from Indiana, and others, have every opportunity to amend that bill in ways that are germane to the legislation that is before us. Debate them, vote them up or down, and move on.

As it turns out, there is probably a lot more on this front that we agree on than we disagree on. One of the ways to find that out for sure is to have the debate.

I pledge to my colleague from Alaska and my colleague from Indiana to do my dead-level best within the Democratic caucus, within the Energy Committee itself, and with my own leadership to make sure we have the opportunity to have fair and open debate on the amendments and a policy that we can then work out with the House and send something to the President to sign.

We may actually have a chance of coming closer to producing a comprehensive energy policy by taking the approach Senator DASCHLE has now suggested. We may actually have a better chance of getting to the debate and the adoption of an energy bill than we would have had if we had gone to regular order. I was not so sure of that 24 hours ago, but having thought it through, I think we may enhance the chances for those of us who want a comprehensive energy policy.

I ask all of my colleagues to work across the aisle, within the committees of jurisdiction, and in the Chamber,

and have a good debate this month or next month and be ready to cast the tough votes and to move on.

I yield the floor and suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORZINE). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I ask that I be allowed to speak as in morning business for 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### ANWR

Mr. MURKOWSKI. Mr. President, I call attention to some of the comments made in this Chamber earlier today relative to the issue of taking up a national energy security bill before this body. I spoke a little earlier on the floor today and indicated that, clearly, it is in the national interest that we in the Senate proceed with an energy bill—report it out, bring it to the floor, and vote on amendments in an orderly manner.

As I further indicated earlier, the majority leader has indicated that it is his intent to develop an energy bill—in his words, a “balanced bill”—and it would be introduced by the majority leader. Of course, this excludes the process associated with the committee reporting out a bill.

Further, in the discussion that has taken place today, the issue of ANWR came up as the bone of contention. I want to address a couple points because there is a good deal of misunderstanding around this issue. There was a reference today that the accident that occurred when a bullet penetrated the pipeline earlier this week was proof that we should not rely on increasing the supply of oil that would traverse through that pipeline.

I remind my colleagues that that pipeline is about 28 years old. It has provided the Nation with 25 percent of the total crude oil produced in the United States for that period of time. That volume has dropped from 25 percent to 17 percent. The pipeline capacity was a little over 2 million barrels a day previously, in the early development of the Prudhoe Bay oil fields, that flowed through that pipeline. Today, with the decline in Prudhoe Bay, it has dropped a significant amount, to roughly 1 million barrels a day. But it still supplies this Nation with 17 percent of the total crude oil produced in this country.

Now, to suggest that this firing by a very high-powered rifle penetrated the pipeline is not quite accurate because

it has been shot at numerous times. It is half-inch, high-tensile steel. It is my understanding that this particular firing—a blast of five bullets—penetrated an area where there is a valve and, as a consequence, because of pressure in the pipeline, there was a significant leak, a spillage. The question of whether there is any permanent damage done has been addressed in the cleanup. There was no movement of any oil into any water or streams in the area. The security group of Alyeska found the incident as a consequence of the notification of a drop in pressure. They went out with helicopters and not only found the leak but identified and arrested the perpetrators. You can criticize anything, but the system did work. Everything is subject to, obviously, the exposure of terrorist activity, but in this particular instance this was a fellow who was extremely drunk, bored, or he lost his mind, and he simply decided it would be fun to start firing at the pipeline.

That pipeline has been bombed; bombs have been wrapped around it. It has been wrapped with hand grenades, shot at, and it suffered exposure of numerous earthquakes over the 27 years and it continues to be one of the wonders of the world. So to suggest that somehow this bullet-piercing accident is somehow questionable relative to the integrity of that pipeline is an expression of very little knowledge—factual knowledge—on behalf of those who suggest that somehow the pipeline can't be trusted for additional flowthrough if indeed ANWR is developed.

I am going to conclude, as I promised my friend from Pennsylvania that I would be brief, with an explanation of some of the more common myths associated with the ANWR issue. I hope we can get ANWR up before this body and vote on it up or down in conjunction with an energy bill. That is the democratic process. Clearly, that did not prevail in the Energy and Natural Resources Committee because I can only assume the votes were there to report out a bill with ANWR in it. I can only assume the votes are in this body to pass an energy bill with ANWR in it. Polling seems to indicate nearly 60 percent of the American public support opening ANWR as a significant contributor to reducing our dependence on imported oil.

Some say there is an insufficient amount of oil. Some say it is only a 6-month supply and not nearly enough to justify exploration. That is nonsense. The U.S. Geological Survey, experts who have studied the 1002 ANWR area, estimate that between 6 and 16 billion barrels of oil are economically recoverable; 10 billion barrels is equivalent to what we would import from Saudi Arabia over a 30-year period; 10 billion barrels is the equivalent of what we import from Iraq for a period of 50 years.

We are importing a million barrels a day from Iraq and enforcing the no-fly zone. We are taking the oil, putting it in our airlines, bombing some of the targets in Iraq, and have for some time. They take our money, pay the Republican Guard, develop a missile capability, and aim it at our ally, Israel.

Maybe that is a short synopsis of foreign policy, but nevertheless I think one can conclude that is the ultimate outcome.

We do not know what is in ANWR because we have never been allowed to determine through modern exploration, through seismic exploration, specifically what is available. Only Congress can authorize it.

What is the extent of the area? It is interesting because ANWR is about 19 million acres—about the size of the State of South Carolina. The proposal is to allow exploration on 1.5 million acres. The House-passed bill, which is H.R. 4, has limited that to 2,000 acres. That is the size of a small farm in the entire State of South Carolina—the wilderness, if you will, as a comparison.

Prudhoe Bay was supposed to produce 10 billion barrels. It is on its 13 millionth barrel today. It is absurd to think ANWR is only a 6-month supply of oil. That is to assume ANWR is the country's only source of oil; that there is no oil produced in Texas, or Louisiana, offshore, or no other oil is being imported into the country. The American people are wise enough to see that argument just does not hold oil, if you will.

Clearly, the potential for this country's domestic supply is ANWR, and the abundance associated with the likelihood of a major discovery is second to none identified in North America. It is almost like wondering if you have a strategic petroleum reserve in your own backyard, but if you do not know, and if you do not have the ability to develop it, you really cannot use it.

What is required in development? Very little. We need authorization by Congress. The House has done its job. The House passed a bill. H.R. 4 includes ANWR. It is a challenge to the Senate to do its job.

Some say it will take as long as 10 years before the oil is flowing and that is too long to make a difference. If the previous President had not vetoed the budget reconciliation bill in 1995, today ANWR would be open, or if the oil was not there, it might have been a park. We could have been less dependent on foreign oil, and our energy future would look a lot more certain if, indeed, we had taken that action back in 1995, but we could not overcome a Presidential veto.

We built the Pentagon in 18 months. We built the Empire State Building in a year. Industry says if they make a

discovery, they can develop and get oil online in somewhere between 18 months and 2½ years, depending on our will to give them the authority within the environmental parameters to do it safely.

Some people say our energy policy is misguided; we need to focus on natural gas. We found 6 trillion cubic feet. Let's use gas. Recognize that America moves on oil. Our planes, our ships, our trains move on oil.

In response to the September 11 attack, we are preparing now for a long, sustained war. Are we going to count on unstable governments in the very part of the world where we are fighting to assure our energy security? We need to begin at home with energy solutions found within our borders, and if we make the commitment to authorize the opening of this area, I assure my colleagues it will be very symbolic. It would send a very solid message to that part of the world were we to continue to increase our dependence on imported oil.

About 67 percent comes from foreign sources, a majority of that from the Mideast. Fighting a war uses a lot of energy. Mr. President, 450,000 barrels of petroleum products were estimated to be used daily, and that was through 582,000 soldiers in the Persian Gulf war. It is estimated we are using over 500,000 barrels a day currently in this conflict.

Some say it is America's Serengeti, its mountains; it is deserted; it is beautiful. Again, it is the size of the State of South Carolina. It is 19 million acres. Can we open it safely? Yes.

Some say we can get the energy from the National Petroleum Reserve in Alaska; that is why it was established. That is wishful thinking because actually just 15 percent of that entire coastline is open for exploration. Just 3 years ago, the Federal Government closed vast amounts of NPR to protect the birds that live in the lakes. If you look at the model and lakes over NPR, that is where bird life is. There are very few lakes associated in the ANWR area.

Finally, there is a concern of the Porcupine caribou and the Gwich'ins, but no one mentioned what is happening on the Canadian side and involvement of the Gwich'ins who are participants in putting up land for lease.

There was an extraordinary article in the Vancouver Sun newspaper indicating the Gwich'ins are benefiting greatly from oil and gas exploration because Canada expanded its oil and gas leasing program to include testing exploratory wells, et cetera.

The bottom line is there seems to be a great fear suddenly to take up an energy bill, with no particular explanation, particularly when the administration has encouraged Congress to take it up, particularly when the House has done its job, and now we are ad-

vised by the majority leader that the committee of jurisdiction, the Energy and Natural Resources Committee, is going to suspend any further markup on energy legislation for "this session"—this session.

I have a press release that states that instead the chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation. The chairman will. It does not say with the participation of the committee or the minority or the Republicans. It says the chairman outside the parameters of the committee.

It further says "the comprehensive and balanced legislation that can be added"—it does not say "will be added;" it says "can be added"—"by the majority leader to the Senate calendar for," it says, "potential action." It does not say "action."

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the press release be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ENERGY COMMITTEE SUSPENDS MARK-UPS; WILL PROPOSE COMPREHENSIVE AND BALANCED ENERGY LEGISLATION TO MAJORITY LEADER

At the request of Senate Majority Leader Tom Daschle, Senate Energy & Natural Resources Committee Chairman Jeff Bingaman today suspended any further mark-up of energy legislation for this session of Congress. Instead, the Chairman will propose comprehensive and balanced energy legislation that can be added by the Majority Leader to the Senate Calendar for potential action prior to adjournment.

Noted Bingaman, It has become increasingly clear to the Majority Leader and to me that much of what we are doing in our committee is starting to encroach on the jurisdictions of many other committees. Additionally, with the few weeks remaining in this session, it is now obvious to all how difficult it is going to be for these various committees to finish their work on energy-related provisions.

Finally, and perhaps most importantly, Bingaman said, the Senate's leadership sincerely wants to avoid quarrelsome, divisive votes in committee. At a time when Americans all over the world are pulling together with a sense of oneness and purpose, Congress has an obligation at the moment to avoid those contentious issues that divide, rather than unite, us.

Bingaman will continue to consult and build consensus with members of his committee, with other committee chairs and with other Senators as he finalizes a proposal to present to the Majority Leader.

Mr. MURKOWSKI. I encourage again the majority leader to reflect on this action, give us the assurance he will take it up during this session and allow sufficient time for Members to provide for amendments, provide us with an opportunity to have an up-or-down vote on contentious issues, and that we meet our obligation as the Senate, as the House of Representatives has done, in addressing what is in the national security interests of our Nation, and that is the passage of the comprehensive energy bill.

I thank my colleague from Pennsylvania for allowing me this extra opportunity to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. MILLER. I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business for up to 5 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### A LOYAL ALLY

Mr. MILLER. Mr. President, I rise today to offer thanks and praise for a world leader who has been as stalwart and as loyal an ally for the United States as anyone could ever ask.

These past few weeks, British Prime Minister Tony Blair has gone above and beyond the call of duty for America. He has left no doubt that we will be able to count on him and his country over the long haul.

To paraphrase his own words, he was with us at the first and he will stay with us to the last.

He was there in the gallery of the House of Representatives when President Bush made his moving and forceful speech to this Nation in a joint session of this Congress.

He was there at Ground Zero in New York City, witnessing the destruction with his own eyes and mourning what he called "the slaughter of thousands of innocents."

He was there in Pakistan, near the dangerous heart of this war, reassuring a nervous Pakistani President that he made the right decision in choosing the United States over the Taliban regime.

Since September 11, Tony Blair has served valiantly as our voluntary ambassador to the world.

In London, Berlin, Paris, New York, Washington, Brussels, Moscow, Islamabad, New Delhi, and Geneva, Blair has rallied international leaders and built a coalition of support for the United States. He has done so with a diplomacy, eloquence and strong resolve reminiscent of Winston Churchill during his finest hours.

In his latest brilliant stroke, Blair acted swiftly when he saw Osama bin Laden's videotaped speech Sunday night. Blair immediately summoned a reporter from the Arabic network to his office at 10 Downing Street and taped his own strong rebuttal to bin Laden. It aired on the same day, on the same Arabic network.

It should not be surprising that Blair would rise to the occasion as ably and powerfully as he has. The British have a tough, resolute attitude when it comes to defending themselves. They are willing to take risks on the battlefield. They are willing to risk casualties for the greater good. They are the ones you want on your side in times like these.

He was with us at the first, and he will stay with us to the last, he said.

For that, we owe Tony Blair our deepest gratitude. We could not ask any more of him.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, in the absence of any other Senator seeking recognition, I ask unanimous consent that I be permitted to speak up to 20 minutes as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### FEDERAL GOVERNMENT NEEDS STRUCTURAL REORGANIZATION

Mr. SPECTER. Mr. President, I have sought recognition to discuss the pending emergency caused by the horrific terrorist attacks on September 11. There is a need for some structural reorganization of the Federal Government in accordance with the recommendations of a number of distinguished commissions which have studied these problems and in accordance with our own findings, as we have worked through the matters in the Senate Intelligence Committee and the Senate Judiciary Committee. There is also the need for legislation to expand the powers of law enforcement on terrorists.

With respect to the newly created Office of Homeland Security, it is my thought there needs to be a structure whereby the position is made a Cabinet position. The Federal Government is fortunate to have secured the services of former Governor Tom Ridge of Pennsylvania to take on this responsibility. For the moment, the office has been created in the executive branch by an Executive Order, and I believe former Governor Ridge is correct when he says, even though other Government officials may not necessarily listen to him if there are turf battles, they certainly will listen to the President. That, I do believe, is true, as former Governor Ridge has represented it.

When we talk about homeland security and that function, we are talking about something which needs to be institutionalized in order to go beyond the term of any President, to go beyond the term of any person who is in charge of that Department, and that, in accordance with our structure of Government, requires legislative action, in my judgment. This is something which we will have to work through with President Bush, with former Governor Ridge, and with the executive branch. However, I offer these thoughts as many Members of Congress are now considering this issue and considering legislation.

Representative THORNBERRY has already introduced legislation in the House of Representatives. Senator LIEBERMAN is working on similar legislation. Senator ROBERT GRAHAM of Florida is working on legislation, as well. My staff and I have been in the

process of working on legislation which I am not yet prepared to introduce, but at the conclusion of these remarks I will ask that draft copies of two bills be printed in the RECORD.

We have had a number of very distinguished commissions analyze these problems. We have had the Hart-Rudman Commission analyze the problems directed to a secure national homeland. That commission pointed out that the keys to prevention are the following tools: 1. diplomacy; 2. U.S. diplomatic, intelligence, and military presence overseas; 3. vigilant systems of border security and surveillance. In order to enhance the effectiveness of the third key, the Hart-Rudman Commission recommended creating a national homeland security agency which would consist of the Coast Guard, the Customs Service, the Border Patrol, and FEMA, the Federal Emergency Management Agency. The legislation I am submitting today, which is in draft form, would adopt the recommendations of the Hart-Rudman Commission.

There has been another distinguished commission, the Brown-Rudman Commission, which has studied the issues of intelligence and has come up with a method and a procedure for streamlining and restructuring the intelligence community.

One of the considerations is that in many Departments of the Federal Government, there are smaller intelligence agencies, for example, in the Departments of Treasury, State, Agriculture, and many other Departments.

At the present time, there is no effective way for dealing with all of these various Departments. The recommendation of the Brown-Rudman Commission was to consolidate and centralize, to give greater authority and power to the Director of Central Intelligence. The Director is charged not only with the operation of the Central Intelligence Agency, but also with the oversight of all the intelligence functions in the United States.

Now, there has admittedly been some gaps and some failures—some major gaps and some major failures—in these turf battles. During the 1995-1996 session of Congress, I had the privilege of serving as the Chairman of the Senate Intelligence Committee. I served in that position for 2 years, in addition to the 6 other years of service on the Intelligence Committee. There is a term limit of eight years on the Intelligence Committee. During the course of that work, I saw the turf battles among the various agencies and became very deeply involved in the issue of weapons of mass destruction, finding that there were dozens of agencies dealing with that issue.

In the Intelligence Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 1996, a commission was created to study weapons of mass destruction. The commission was chaired by former CIA Director John Deutch,